

Application No. 10/035,487
Paper Dated December 4, 2003
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of November 4, 2003
Attorney Docket No. 388-011772

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. Claim 7 has been amended.

The Examiner has required election between the following inventions:

- I. Claims 1-6, drawn to processes
- II. Claim 7, drawn to an apparatus

The Applicants respectfully elect the claims of Group I, namely, claims 1-6, with traverse.

The Examiner stated that the inventions of Groups I and II are distinct because, in this case, the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process, e.g., drying any food product. Claim 7 has been amended to limit the use of the apparatus to that of implementing the method of claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants believe that the Examiner's restriction requirement is now moot.


Furthermore, all of the claims include common subject matter relating to processing starch grain material through a microwave irradiating step. It is apparent that searches directed to the claims of either Group I or II would clearly overlap each other. Such co-extensive searching would not present any undue burden on the Examiner for examination of the claims.

For the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

Examination and allowance of pending claims 1-7 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WEBB ZIESENHEIM LOGSDON
ORKIN & HANSON, P.C.

By 

Jessica M. Schroth
Registration No. 47,102
Attorney for Applicants
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219-1818
Telephone: 412-471-8815
Facsimile: 412-471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com